

APPLICANT(S): STRASMAN, Nery, et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/693,509  
FILED: October 24, 2003  
Page 13

### **REMARKS**

The present response is intended to be fully responsive to all points of objection and/or rejection raised by the Examiner and is believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

Applicants assert that the present invention is new, non-obvious and useful. Prompt consideration and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

### **Status of Claims**

Claims **1, 3-54, 56-105** and **110-111** are pending. Claims **1, 3-54, 56-105** and **110-111** have been rejected.

Claims **1, 40** and **47** have been amended.

Applicants respectfully assert that the amendments to the claims add no new matter.

APPLICANT(S): STRASMAN, Nery, et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/693,509  
FILED: October 24, 2003  
Page 14

### **Claim Objections**

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims **1, 40, 47** and **54** because of alleged informalities. Claims **1, 40** and **46** have been amended to positively recite the receiving and multiplexing devices, as suggested by the Examiner.

The subject matter of claim 54 is an apparatus and the Applicants do not understand the remark of the Examiner, which refers to method type claims, in the context of claim 54.

Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the objection.

### **CLAIM REJECTIONS**

#### **35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections**

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims **1, 3-39, 54, 56-91** and **110-111** under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Zhang et al (US Patent 6,891,854) in view of Bennett et al (US Patent 6,421,359) and further in view of Namba (US Patent 5,966,448).

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims **1, 3-39, 54, 56-91** and **110-111**.

The Zhang reference teaches separating a bit stream into video, audio and data portions and then decoding and extracting only the video. The video is modified to change the bit rate, and then encoded and combined with the other portions (audio and data) that make up the bit stream.

The Zhang reference teaches multiplexing of three types of streams: audio, video and data streams.

Zhang describes the bit rate converter in column 6 lines 51-54 that performs a modification that alters the encoding type of the entire video stream.

The Zhang and the Bennett references **do not disclose encrypted media streams or modifying non-encrypted streams**.

Nor the Zhang reference neither the Bennett reference, alone or in cousin, teach or suggest a set of video streams with two types of stream components – one encrypted and the other non-encrypted– as recited by independent claims **1** and **54**.

As argued by the Examiner, the Zhang reference teaches a video stream and a data stream, which is unlike the video stream of the current application which includes both encrypted media stream components and non-encrypted media stream components.

The Examiner suggests that the Namba reference discloses receiving media streams that includes encrypted and non-encrypted media streams.

The Applicants respectfully disagree. The Namba reference teaches transmitting data from one terminal to another terminal, wherein the first terminal is connected to a local area network (LAN) that uses a certain cryptographic algorithm and the second terminal is connected to a LAN that uses another cryptographic algorithm, thus the data is sent decrypted but is divided to k data items, each 1/k of the original data is sent to a different cryptographic protocol conversion servers out of k servers.

The Namba reference **does not teach media streams**. The Namba reference is not related to video processing, MPEG, video streams, and does not refer to any element that is part of the field of video transmission, such as a stream multiplexer, MPEG encoder, HFC and so on. Thus, the Namba reference cannot be considered as the same field of art as the Zhang and Bennett references and cannot be combined with the Zhang and Bennett references.

Further more, the Namba reference does not teach “Receiving a set of media streams, each media stream of the set of media streams comprises non-encrypted media stream components and encrypted media stream components”. As was set forth above, the Namba reference does not teach receiving media streams and does not teach or suggest performing any kind of manipulation of media streams. The Namba reference does not teach receiving and handling **a mixture** of encrypted and non-encrypted of any data item. The Namba reference teaches splitting an encrypted data to multiple non-encrypted data items.

None of the Zhang, Bennett and Namba references, alone or in combination teach or suggest: “Receiving, by an interface, a set of **media streams**, each media stream of the set of

APPLICANT(S): STRASMAN, Nery, et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/693,509  
FILED: October 24, 2003  
Page 16

media streams comprises **non-encrypted media stream components and encrypted media stream components**”- as recited in independent claims **1** and **54**.

None of the Zhang, Bennett and Namba references, alone or in combination teach or suggest: “**multiplexing**, by a multiplexing unit, **at least the encrypted media stream components and the modified non-encrypted media stream components**”- as recited in independent claims **1** and **54**.

An obviousness rejection requires a teaching or a suggestion by the relied upon prior art of all the elements of a claim (M.P.E.P. §2142). Since Zhang or Bennett or Namba, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest all the elements of any of independent claims **1** and **54**, the Examiner fails to establish a prima facie showing that Zhang or Bennett or Namba, alone or in combination, teach or suggest every feature of claims **1** and **54**.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims **1** and **54** are likewise allowable.

Claims **3-39**, **56-91** and **110-111** depend from, directly or indirectly, claims **1** and **54**, and therefore include all the limitations of those claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims **3-39**, **56-91** and **110-111** are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to amended independent claims **1** and **54** and to claims **3-39**, **56-91** and **110-111** dependent thereon.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims **40-53** and **92-105** under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), as being unpatentable over Zhang et al (US Patent 6,795,506) in view of Kollmyer et al (US Patent 7,165,1751) and further in view of Namba.

Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of claims **40-53** and **92-105**.

The Zhang reference does not teach “converting the media stream to multiple layers that provide at least one out of a spatial scalability and a temporal scalability”. The Examiner suggests that column 15 lines 36-56 of the Zhang reference teaches “encoding streams into multiple layers”, however, the referred text does not disclose “converting the media stream to multiple layers that provide at least one out of **a spatial scalability and a temporal scalability**”

APPLICANT(S): STRASMAN, Nery, et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/693,509  
FILED: October 24, 2003  
Page 17

The Kollmyer reference does not refers to spatial scalability and a temporal scalability and does not teach encrypting at least a portion of at least one layer that provides at least one out of a spatial scalability and a temporal scalability. Thus, the Kollmyer cannot cure the deficiencies of the Zhang reference.

As was set forth above, the Namba reference does not teach media streams and does not teach encrypting of media streams and cannot be considered as the same field of art as the Zhang and Kollmyer references.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims **40, 47, 92 and 99** are likewise allowable.

Claims **41-46, 48-53, 93-98 and 100-105** depend from, directly or indirectly, claims **40, 47, 92 and 99**, and therefore include all the limitations of those claims. Therefore, Applicants respectfully assert that claims **41-46, 48-53, and 100-105** are likewise allowable. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections to independent claims **40, 47, 92 and 99** and to claims **41-46, 48-53, 93-98 and 100-105** dependent thereon.

APPLICANT(S): STRASMAN, Nery, et al.  
SERIAL NO.: 10/693,509  
FILED: October 24, 2003  
Page 18

### **Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants assert that the pending claims are allowable. Their favorable reconsideration and allowance is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner have any question or comment as to the form, content or entry of this Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number below. Similarly, if there are any further issues yet to be resolved to advance the prosecution of this application to issue, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,

/Oren Reches/

Oren Reches

Attorney/Agent for Applicants

Registration No. 53,506

Dated: April 4, 2010

### **Reches Patents**

211 North Union Street, Suite 100

Alexandria, Virginia 22314

United States

Tel: (703) 838 5568

Fax: (703) 683 4707